

LUKAS, NACE, GUTIERREZ & SACHS

CHARTERED

1111 NINETEENTH STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20036
(202) 857-3500

**WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL
(202) 828-9475**

March 24, 2003

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Marlene Dortch, Secretary
Office of Managing Director
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20554

**Re: Oral *Ex Parte* Presentation
Virginia Cellular LLC
Petition for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications
Carrier in the State of Virginia
CC Docket No. 96-45**

Dear Madam Secretary:

In accordance with Section 1.1206 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR Section 1.1206, we hereby provide you with notice of an oral *ex parte* presentation in connection with the above-captioned proceeding. On Thursday, March 20, 2003, David LaFuria and Steven Chernoff met with Jessica Rosenworcel, legal advisor to Commissioner Michael J. Copps, on behalf of Virginia Cellular LLC ("Virginia Cellular"). The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the merits of Virginia Cellular's pending application for Eligible Telecommunications Carrier ("ETC") status currently before the Commission.

At the meeting, counsel for Virginia Cellular reiterated the company's position as expressed in its prior filings in this docket, stressing the public benefits that would result from a prompt grant of its petition. Counsel emphasized that, with access to high-cost support now available only to incumbents, the company will be able to expand its network and begin to provide rural consumers with telecommunications service alternatives similar to those available in urban areas. Counsel stated that the company's petition is identical in all important respects to several other requests for ETC status that the Commission has granted. Additionally, counsel emphasized that the ongoing review of the Commission's ETC rules does not provide a reason for further delay of an application that complies with current rules and policies.

The parties also discussed Virginia Cellular's request to redefine rural ILEC service areas pursuant to Section 214(e)(5) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. Counsel for Virginia Cellular stated that the requested redefinition squarely meets the standards articulated

by the Commission and the Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service. In particular, counsel explained that ILECs' "cream skimming" arguments are fully neutralized by their ability to disaggregate and target high-cost support to a more discrete level than the study area.

If you have any questions or require any additional information, please contact undersigned counsel directly.

Sincerely,

/s/ David A. LaFuria

David A. LaFuria
Steven M. Chernoff

cc: Jessica Rosenworcel, Esq.